



**The Town of Hilton Head Island
Regular Public Facilities Committee
Meeting**

Monday, November 27, 2017

10:00 a.m.

Council Chambers

AGENDA

As a Courtesy to Others Please Turn Off All Cell Phones and Pagers during the Meeting

1. Call to Order

2. Freedom of Information Act Compliance

Public notification of this meeting has been published, posted, and mailed in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and the Town of Hilton Head Island requirements.

3. Committee Business

- Approval of Minutes:
 1. October 23, 2017
 2. October 30, 2017
- Change to 2018 Meeting Dates
 - On October 23, 2017, the Committee approved the proposed 2018 Meeting Dates. The meeting scheduled for May 28, 2018 falls on a day that Town Hall is closed in observance of Memorial Day. This meeting will need to be cancelled and rescheduled at a later date, if needed.

4. Unfinished Business

- Recommendation of Policies to Guide the Private Unpaved Road Acquisition and Paving Program.

5. New Business

- Telecommunications Update
- Town Council Request for Traffic Signal Analysis at Long Cove Club Drive and US 278 (Business) and Converted Public Use of Emergency Access into Long Cove Club

6. Adjournment

Please note that a quorum of Town Council may result if four (4) or more of Town Council members attend this meeting.

TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND PUBLIC FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Date: October 23, 2017

Time: 10:00 A.M.

Members Present: Marc Grant, David Ames, Tom Lennox

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Scott Liggett, Charles Cousins, Darrin Shoemaker, Jeff Buckalew, James Cook, Teri Lewis, Jayme Lopko, Marcy Benson, Brian Hulbert, Jennifer Ray, Chief Brad Tadlock, Joheida Fister

Others Present: David Bennett, *Mayor*, Chet Williams, Esq., Stu Rodman, *Beaufort County Council*, Colin Kinton, *Beaufort County Transportation Engineer*, Mel Campbell

Media Present: None

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. FOIA Compliance:

Public notification of this meeting has been published, posted and mailed in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and the Town of Hilton Head Island requirements.

3. Committee Business:

Approval of Minutes: Councilman Ames moved to approve the Minutes of October 3, 2017. Councilman Lennox seconded. The Minutes of October 3, 2017 were unanimously approved.

Approval of Draft 2018 Public Facilities Committee Meeting Dates:

Councilman Ames moved to approve. Councilman Lennox seconded. Chairman Grant wanted to know if 10:00 a.m. was good or would anyone want to adjust it a little earlier. The Committee Members said 10:00 was fine, but if the Chairman wanted it earlier that was fine too. The Motion was amended to reflect the new start time of 9:00 a.m. The Motion unanimously passed.

Councilman Ames stated there was one topic he wanted clarification on. At our last meeting we discussed a traffic signal at Long Cove Club and Highway 278. We as a Committee approved looking into that but I do not know what the next step is. I need some guidance.

Scott Liggett stated in response to the discussion at the last Committee Meeting, the Town Manager has directed that we be prepared when we are able in the context of other priorities and other happenings to at least give you a staff reaction to that. However, it may be best that there be some formal action taken by Council to make that an assignment. One of the things that remains an interest and a struggle at times is figuring out how these add-ons get inserted to the program of work that you at the Council level have already

authorized us to pursue. That we would be prepared right now to come back at the staff level and report out on the issues of the process by which signal warrant studies are typically undertaken. We can share what traffic information. We can share with you the limitations of the easement that was secured there at the back side of Long Cove to allow for the emergency access and at least come forward with a staff presentation regarding those issues at your next meeting.

Councilman Ames said fine but it sounded like two different things. One is you are looking at the Council as a body to direct the Town Manager for next steps and two, the staff is prepared to come back to this Committee and outline the process. Mr. Liggett said yes, the process and the information – kind of an immediate response to the idea or notion that was presented last meeting. The issue I would have is that if it does come to pass, where does that fall in the priorities? Our struggle remains why are we working on something that has not been declared a priority in deference to those items that have been. That is where we will need some help from Council to direct us what is it you would like us to make a priority or to be working on.

Chairman Grant stated he is in favor of finding out more in terms of presentation and what the issues are in terms of Long Cove before I am looking to make a decision. Mr. Liggett stated if it meets with the timeline of the Committee, perhaps we make this staff presentation at your next meeting and then we decide where it goes from there.

4. Unfinished Business

None

6. New Business

- **Request to Change the Name of the Existing Fish Haul Creek Park to Historic Mitchelville Freedom Park and Change the Name of the Existing Mitchelville Beach Park to Fish Haul Beach Park**

Jayme Lopko stated it is Staff's recommendation the Public Facilities Committee recommend Town Council change the name of the existing Fish Haul Creek Park to Historic Mitchelville Freedom Park and change the name of the existing Mitchelville Beach Park to Fish Haul Beach Park.

In order to avoid duplication and confusion over using the Mitchelville name in parks, Town staff is proposing to change the name of the Mitchelville Beach Park. The requested name of Fish Haul Beach Park is consistent with current park naming conventions and consistent with LMO requirements.

After a brief discussion, Councilman Ames motioned that the Public Facilities Committee approve the recommendation of staff. Councilman Lennox seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

- **Right-of-Way Acquisition Involving Town Owned Land – US 278 Jenkins Island Access Improvement Project**

Colin Kinton, Beaufort County Traffic Engineer stated he was here to bring up the U.S. 278 Improvement Project on Jenkins Island. This is a project we have been working on for 18 months to bring safety improvements to the residents and the traffic along

Jenkins Island and involves widening and median improvements and actually median closures to facilitate safe ingress and egress along that section of highway. In doing that the widening that is going to be undertaken, we are going to be widening to the north side of 278 which is Town owned property. That is to avoid on the south side where Windmill Harbour is they have a large berm and if we widen symmetrically or just on the south it would have significant impacts on that berm. So to avoid it, we are going to widen on the north side. In the packet before you are the exhibits. It is a little more than 4.7 acres. Generally it is about a 35 foot strip on the north side of U.S. 278 going from the bridges and Blue Heron Point all the way over to the causeway going over to Hilton Head Island. There is one small section which is about 400 feet east of Jenkins Road where we are accommodating for U-turns for the signalized U-turn movement so there is a little additional right of way there.

Councilman Ames said he had a philosophical question that probably bears no weight in the conversation, but would like to say it anyway. Back in 1974/75, the County was contemplating expanding 278 which at that time was a two lane road. A group of citizens actually walked the length of 278 on the Island and did an ad-hoc tree survey in hopes of protecting the ambiance and character of Hilton Head Island. We have had a number of expansions to our transportation system since then which have dramatically changed the ambiance and character of the Island. I think the balance that needs to be achieved is one between that ambiance and character and the necessity of moving people on and off the Island. I am not convinced that we have achieved that balance in this design, but I do not have a better solution. I am very much aware of the amount of effort that has been put in this to this time. On the philosophical question I am reluctant to say this is the best solution but acknowledge the practicality of where we are.

The technical or pragmatic question I had is this is a six lane road that merges into a two lane road for a couple thousand feet. What is the County's plan to address that issue? Mr. Kinton indicated presently SCDOT is undertaking an environmental assessment for that entire corridor going from Moss Creek all the way to Squire Pope. That environmental assessment will address the future of that entire corridor and what is needed as far as bridge capacity and roadway capacity and alignment. Right now we see this as an immediate need and have begun the work on this before the larger project came about.

Councilman Ames asked if Mr. Kinton could give an estimate when the second phase of this would be ready to implement. Mr. Kinton said it is going to be approximately three years. SCDOT is in the process of negotiating with a Consultant to begin the environmental assessment and that environmental assessment will probably take 2 ½ years to complete and then construction. So we are looking at another 2 ½-3 years of construction in looking at new bridges and bridge widening to be done.

Councilman Ames said so we will be moving traffic into a two lane situation – are we really solving a problem or are we just changing the location of where that problem occurs. Mr. Kinton said we are solving a safety problem and the safety problem is on Jenkins Island with the existing three access locations. The traffic through there is very congested during many hours of the day and very few gaps allowing traffic to get in and out safely.

Councilman Ames said he has enough of a background to understand the dilemma, I am making the point if there is any way for this Town to accelerate the second phase would be beneficial.

Scott Liggett said Mr. Kinton had mentioned what I see as a longer term solution. My response to your question as to what the County intended to do about that missing gap would have been I think the County intends the Town to advance the project that we have long identified that will fill that gap I suspect between this project may be completed and when that longer term study and work that involves the entire corridor comes to bear. We do have funds identified starting next fiscal year that allows that segment between where the County's project will end and Squire Pope Road begins to fill that gap with construction monies. We have been running for some time admittedly an out of sync arrangement with our project when you compare it with the other priorities that have been established on the south end.

Chairman Grant asked if there was public comment. Mr. Mel Campbell stated they had a public hearing on this project back in May with the County and I think what we are concerned about is the combination of projects and the phases and why it is not done first of all in one phase. Why aren't we waiting for the SCDOT to do a complete study of both parts of it? Why does the County go on and do a short gap and later on the Town is going to come in and do their completion. I am concerned with the values of the properties and the viability of the properties on the native island side of that entrance. There are families on both sides and they are going to be dramatically impacted.

Mayor Bennett said they are looking at the immediate public safety issue in Windmill Harbour area and looking at the long term projection of traffic flow through that corridor. To Mel's point I think this is why I consider the overarching issue facing our community finding that level of sustainable balance between the tourism industry, the people who live here and our work force. Whatever that balance is when you are out of balance it has implications. Implications on the infrastructure that is needed to support whatever amount of traffic and tourism you are going to find and allow for in your community. We have a single spine and single point of entry into the Island. They are trying to accommodate the infrastructure we are allowing for, but I have this continuous overarching gut feeling that we are out of balance in terms of what that amount of tourism that we are looking for. You have 40,000 people who live here year round that have needs, that have reasons why they moved here, why they invested in our community and I think we need to by admonishment this morning to all of us is to start asking or continue asking those hard question – where is that balance because it has as we are seeing here this morning continuing implications on our infrastructure needs. We are talking about the entry into our community. The first impression that we are given in people who come here and I am still working in my mind to reconcile what should be the respite of an Island with six lanes of traffic bisecting out community. I have been involved in other communities elsewhere where they are literally working and have been working the other way – trying to remove the obstacle that is created when you bisect communities with super highways. I am not here this morning to speak against these plans, they may very well be needed to save lives. I do not think

that that relieves us of responsibility as a Council to asking those hard questions and finding that point of sustainability because my gut tells me we haven't found that yet.

Chairman Grant stated he agrees to we need to find a better way in terms of this main intersection. However, we have a public safety issue in terms of that area. Hopefully this will be a short term fix so that the traffic can continue to flow and people will be able to get to their homes safely and vice versa. I am asking that we continue to do our due diligence and find a way like the Mayor said and find some sustainability that is realistic in terms of this major super highway coming through our community.

Councilman Lennox moved to approve as presented. Councilman Ames seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

- **A Plan for the Scheduling of Improvements of Privately Owned Roads Discussion**
Scott Liggett stated with respect to an introduction here as part of the adopted 2017 Key Priorities, a plan for the scheduling of private road improvements was targeted for completion by the end of the year. Let me first say I am not here to necessarily present a staff recommendation at this point. What we had hoped to do through today's meeting and a second discussion targeted to occur on October 30th was to glean a sense of the Committee those things that we thought were important that may help us in the short term identify such a schedule. The other thing I would mention is we have tried to target the Town Council Meeting on November 7th as the date at which some plan may be taken forward to Council for their review and presumably action.

With respect to a short history and some program objectives as previously stated, keep in mind that the acquisition of dirt roads has its roots back to 2010 when there was a line item established for the first time. Initially those funds were intended to acquire land only. It did not have a carry over to actually pave those roads. The plan when we started this program would be to transfer any lands that we may have acquired to the County ultimately for paving in their program. A couple of years into the program, the County informed us they did not have the capacity to continue to add to their roadway network and were not interested in doing that. The Town's reaction was to establish the funding that has been put in place here the last couple of years that would allow acquisition and paving to both occur under the auspices of the Town. As always we are not allowed to spend public money on private property. In order to provide the infrastructure to provide the services that folks are requesting land acquisition is necessarily part of that plan. These dirt roads for the most part exist over a variety of privately owned parcels. The plan is to acquire that land, bring them into public ownership, improve them and then maintain them in perpetuity.

With regard to today's discussion, you may have some additional points to be added to this the list below, but it is my hope in today's discussion and the following discussion next week to try and get some reaction from Committee and then Council to these items.

- Program Scope
- LMO Compliance
- Donation of land vs. payment for land

- Response to petition by willing participants (irrespective of ratings)
- Use of community volunteers (vice Town Staff) to secure necessary R/W
- Availability/Allocation of Funding – 3 primary sources – approximately \$1.2M/year.

I would suggest all of these to some degree have an implication on the cost or the time of the program or maybe both. As we begin to identify the plan, the program, the schedule, I think it is important to discuss all of these things in due time. What we are hoping to do today is to address in detail those first two bullet items – the Program Scope and LMO Compliance as a result of our actions. I would also like to get a reaction of a current discussion that is going on whether or not the Town should continue with the expectation that property owners would be paid for the acquisition or whether the program line the County should be predicated on donation of that land. The fourth bullet there, again kind of mirroring the County Program – to what degree if we had willing participants come forward should that trump our actions. If we have a neighborhood or street that is willing to work with us is that where we should devote our attention.

With respect to the Program Scope and this arguably may be one of the most important things to reach some conclusion on – currently there are 33 privately owned roads that are unpaved that have more than five dwellings/address points. There are an additional 50 smaller scale roads that serve five or fewer address points. The reason I make that distinction and I think it is an important one. Currently the LMO allows for small scale subdivisions presumably those that require little to no infrastructure that create little to no demands to go on without establishing formal right of way, without having any approved infrastructure. If there is an interest that ultimately Council may have on considering paving or acquiring those 50 additional roads, I think there may have to be some discussion on whether not we allow that program to perpetuate because in many cases, allowing those small scale developments to occur that may make things more costly, more time consuming, more difficult really serves a disservice of the program. It would be my recommendation that we focus only on the 33 larger scale roads that serve five or more address points.

As we try to determine a schedule if we want to identify how fast we are going to run the race, someone needs to tell us how long is the race we are running. This is a very important point going forward whether or not there is the interest on the Committee or the Council's perspective that we look at all dirt roads or only those larger scale dirt roads. I think I should also mention that of the 33 roads, 1/3 of them are also part of the PSD's Sewer Expansion Program. There is some coordination through time although their program is running as you all know a five year implementation. There may be some overlap and benefit in devoting some resources there.

In total, the acquisition of those 33 roads amounts to about 22 acres of land if you assume a 40 foot right of way – adding the additional 50 roads to it more than doubles the need there – it looks like to an additional 24 acres.

All of these roads, irrespective to how many address points they serve have been rated annually by the Town as part of our program. They are prioritized based on the ranking

scheme that is listed. That is what has formed the basis for staff's recommendation as to which roads we should endeavor to pursue each year. We consider the criteria that are listed: # of dwellings served, road condition, existing easements or right of way and benefit/cost ratio (construction.)

As a result of the previous work in those rankings, these are the eight roads that I would suggest to you are in the pipeline for consideration:

- Murray Avenue
- Alfred Lane
- Bligen Lane
- Aiken Place
- Cobia Court – CDBG acquisition underway
- Mitchelville Lane
- Pine Field Road
- Alice Perry Drive
- Bligen Lane

Irrespective of ultimately how this discussion goes, a lot of roads, a few roads, LMO Compliance, requests for donation, seeking community volunteers – regardless of any of that it would be my recommendation to you that we start with those three roads. Those are the roads we have been working on the longest. We have enough information I believe to engage those communities and if time permits today we have some aerial photographs we can use to try and give you a taste in what is involved in and around each of these roads.

Regarding LMO Compliance and one of the simple questions that I would pose is do we endeavor to build LMO compliant roads or not. If we don't, to what degree we may want to seek variances from what standards. Historically, when we have gone to the communities to establish road rights of way this is one of the more complicated issues. It has a lot of different tentacles associated with it.

Let me start with the calculation of how wide a right of way we need in the first place. That is all dictated by the LMO and the annual average daily traffic that is thought to be projected from the adjacent land uses. My preference is like the County's 50 foot minimum right of way – that is what I would suggest would serve the Town's interest the best. I do not think we should be acquiring 30 foot wide rights of way which the LMO suggests for some of these small order streets.

The design standards that are dictated by the LMO typically we like to use a normally crowned roads such that the storm water that is created by the road itself is directed to the roadway shoulders and ultimately roadside ditches that would be built. The wider rights of way we have the better able we are to construct proper roadside ditches and swales. Also the better able we are to accommodate storm water runoff from adjacent parcels. We will always be limited to going on to parcels to do any kind of re-grading or directing of storm water that may generate from those private properties but it is I would suggest to you easier, more efficient, less costly and potentially less impactful to provide those roadside ditches as opposed to a closed drainage system with curb and gutter with pipes, particularly since the drainage from those adjacent properties is much out of our control.

We have begun examining opportunities to use pervious pavement to minimize the impacts that may come from the road itself. The LMO also speaks to minimum clear zones for the safety of the motorists. Many of these clear zone requirements and clearance requirements in general are not necessarily in place here today. Driveways are another item that is often times not addressed formally in the current configuration. We may have developments where the general habits of the adjacent land owners is just to pull off the dirt road however they are able at their house. It would be my recommendation that we identify single point driveways that would provide access to those properties. The last point that I would mention here is the geometric end treatments. The hammerheads or cul-de-sacs at the end of these roads from the standpoint of service, delivery trucks, Fire Rescue apparatus and the like –one of the reasons that this issue comes to light is it could be argued that those property owners who happen to live now at the end of these dirt roads may be impacted by the land that we need to assemble the cul-de-sac or the hammerhead.

Regarding encroachments, it would be my preference that we have no encroachments into publically owned rights of way. There is a variety of development that has occurred that we are now trying to shoehorn this right of way around. Some of those encroachments we may be better able to live with than others, but things like fences and landscaping, sheds, habitable structures to a degree all create challenges for us. I would suggest to you those encroachments that may create safety hazards are highly problematic. The others perhaps we can look at case by case. We definitely will create a variety of encroachments into that right of way.

Because none of these roads exist within road rights of way there are not necessarily buffers and setbacks as measured from that right of way. As we come through a dirt road area, create a 40-50 foot corridor, there will necessarily be buffers and setbacks that go along with that action.

Councilman Ames said we have a situation here that is symbolic of the conflicts that we have had as a Town and as traditional residents. I think the mindset of imposing LMO standards and ideal engineering standards is going to be a problem. I would say that the process that we employ to get to an end result is going to be of ultimate value. We recognize that trust is a huge issue so how we derive our answers, how we ask our questions is going to be very important. As I look down on your list of five items – LMO, donation of land, response to petition, etc., I see LMO as being a stumbling block. How we arbitrate our ideal standards and what native islanders or whoever is affected in the area might want. Donation of land I think it probably can be demonstrated that the County hasn't had a lot of people taking advantage of that property because native islanders have a value of their land that is much higher perhaps than the monetary value and so it may not be money alone that is going to trigger participation. Response to petition – I think that if we create a way that those people who are living on these streets feel as though they are driving the bus we are probably going to get to a place sooner than if we are trying to impose what we would consider an absolute rational priority system, but in fact in their minds it is arbitrary.

I am thinking that conceptually we have to have community volunteers participating so that there is the trust so that there is a different kind of priority established. Funding – I

don't know but it looks like we have roughly ten miles of road – don't know what it costs to do a mile of road, but it seems to me that if we are truly committed to solving this issue and when I say solve this issue, I would like a higher level of confidence that this is something that is being driven by the people who live on those roads as well as safety standards that we as a Town see are important. Once that both those points of demand are established or need then I wonder whether or not the Town's response ought to be some kind of dedicated bond to attack this issue as an accelerated rate. That accelerated rate depends on the availability of the rights of way, etc. Those are my comments at a conceptual level.

Councilman Grant said he would like a little more knowledge on LMO Compliance. The reason why I say that is you hear so many different stories about how LMO takes away so much of the property that it downgrades the value. I would like to sit down with Town officials and understand each road that we do better. So when we say in terms of encroachment, setbacks that I can understand it clearly so we can tell the landowner why this is the best use of your property for this particular road and they can actually see it.

Regarding donation of land, I believe wholeheartedly donation of land and the reason why that is their stake in terms of increasing the value of their property with the road and they are coming to us telling us there is a problem. They can't deal with the traffic, the road is not being well maintained. Those people who do not want to do it have a reason why. Regarding community volunteers I agree with that but also working with the Town staff and not just solely community volunteers. I believe in the past we need to build a bridge more with Town and Community. I think we have good funding, but do need to increase that funding in terms of Town monies. Based on what we have talked about in the past I would like to get the road work done faster.

Councilman Ames said if we miraculously have all these roads signed up, rights of way available, etc., the Council took action almost a year ago imposing a fee on licenses. I don't know what that generates – Mr. Liggett said about \$900,000/yr. If that were a dedicated source of funding that could pay off a pretty sizable bond. Mr. Liggett said clearly we could make some headway here with that funding source to pave roads if we actually owned the land.

Councilman Ames asked if we accept it for the moment process is going to be incredibly important to have a successful build out of what we are talking about. How do we have that conversation? How do we get people involved so we can make progress? Mr. Liggett said I think what we are prepared to take on next at the Special Meeting on the 30th. Today I would describe this meeting discussion as the “what” and next week's meeting as the “how”. There has been an interest expressed on numerous occasions in trying to use or leverage the program that the PSD was successful with, with these community volunteers getting easements for the sewer expansion. Admittedly we are after a different animal here, but we are prepared to have a discussion mostly through the Town's Legal Department. I am still working with Council's Attorney on the discussion, but how we may be able to authorize private citizens to secure land for the Town. What are the boundaries, what are the level of authority to what degree they are able to negotiate or not on behalf of the Town? How many, if any, of these LMO considerations they can

negotiate, how does staff get plugged in? We need to talk about this and are prepared to talk about it next week.

Councilman Grant asked about the 40 foot vs. 50 foot right of way. Could a Fire Truck still go down and turn around with a 40 foot right of way. Joheida Fister said the right of way is really the width of what is available, but we pave 20 feet of that. The 20 feet is what we are driving on. It makes it easier when there is not stuff next to us when we are driving or trying to pass people coming down a road. The right of way does help us but it is actually the 20 foot driving surface that we are looking for for Fire Rescue.

Councilman Lennox mentioned that Bluffton to a much smaller degree has the same process as the county in that they take the applications based on the consensus of the landowners. As you talk about process further to include next week, I would encourage you to move in that direction.

Mr. Liggett asked if there was any interest and I am not trying to prolong the discussion, but we do have aerial photography available if you are interested in understanding a little bit better lay of the land at Murray Avenue, Aiken Place and Alfred Lane – how those streets are set up. Councilman Ames said he had a time constraint today, but next week is fine.

Chairman Grant asked for public comment. Mr. Mel Campbell said that if paving a road is going to impact drainage then I look at that as a Town responsibility entirely. Our system of drainage has been pushed upon the unpaved, undrained areas of the Island by the communities that already have their system in place. The LMO was written primarily after those systems were in place and the LMO's with easements basically impact our community. These roads are private roads which means it is my land so the Town's right to pave them doesn't exist – I don't care whether the Town does have a responsibility to provide safety. Your right to pave my land does not exist and even with easements when we give easements we are still taxed on the land that we gave easements for. Our acreage remains the same. These are just minor details why you are not going to get the easements. Paving the roads as they exist undermines the growth and economic possibilities as those roads exist they were made 100, 75, 50 years ago for the convenience of the homes that existed then regardless of the other developments in the area of drainage necessities because ditches were present then that allowed proper drainage for the situation. These roads now you have to look in terms of a futuristic sense before you pave these roads because a lot of time they are restrictive in terms of what people can do with their properties because of the road. That requires a lot more intense negotiations with the families involvement with the families on both plans – the Town's plans and their plans. I do not see that happening. Personally I went to get easement for sewage and we got that accomplished with the first couple of phases but I cannot see myself advocating for the Town to get easements to get paved roads on top of the sewer easement and on top of the utility easements. You are overbearing us with the basic individual needs of utilities and institutions. The Town needs these roads paved so they can apply proper drainage so that the Island doesn't sink. Now that you realize you need it we never needed it before and now that you need it your responsibility becomes greater than me giving you the land to do that.

Mr. Grant asked Mr. Campbell if he was in favor of roads being paved. He responded he was in favor of roads being paved with certain designs accommodating those pavements. I am in favor of proper drainage but these things cannot occur with the existing roads along with people taking advantage of their property ownership.

7. Adjournment

Chairman Grant moved to adjourn. Councilman Lennox seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen D. Knox
Senior Administrative Assistant

DRAFT

TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND PUBLIC FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Date: October 30, 2017

Time: 10:00 A.M.

Members Present: Marc Grant, David Ames, Tom Lennox

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Steve Riley, Scott Liggett, Jeff Buckalew, Charles Cousins, Brian Hulbert, Esq., Teri Lewis, Anne Cyran, James Cook, Marcy Benson, Jennifer Ray, Brad Tadlock, Joheida Fister, Shawn Colin, Jayme Lopko

Others Present: David Bennett, *Mayor*, John McCann, *Councilman*, Kim Likins, *Mayor Pro-Tem*, Frank Soule, *Island Recreation Association*, Chet Williams, Esq., Gregg Alford, Esq., *Town Attorney*,

Media Present: Alex, Kincaid, *Island Packet*

1. **Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

2. **FOIA Compliance:**

Public notification of this meeting has been published, posted and mailed in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act and the Town of Hilton Head Island requirements.

3. **Committee Business:**

Approval of Minutes: None

4. **Unfinished Business**

None

5. **New Business**

• **Proposed Cordillo Tennis Courts Park – Potential Park Elements**

Anne Cyran stated staff recommends the Public Facilities Committee recommend Town Council approve the list of potential park elements to be used to develop plans for permitting and construction.

Potential Park Elements:

Proposed Uses:

- 1) Community gathering space
- 2) Adult and youth tennis
- 3) Pickle ball

Proposed Physical Improvements:

- 1) Building with restrooms, community gathering space, and an office and storage space
- 2) Construct 1-2 full size courts for adult tennis

- 3) Construct 2-3 full size courts for flexible use to accommodate youth tennis and pickle ball
- 4) Parking

The Town proposes redeveloping the Cordillo Tennis Courts for tennis and pickle ball and to build a community building with meeting space, an office and storage space, and restrooms. This would only be a recommendation of the concept, obviously not of the project.

The current approved budget does not have sufficient funds to cover the proposed items. Staff will include a recommendation for funding in the FY19 CIP if recommended for approval.

The Cordillo tennis courts are located on Cordillo Parkway. The 1.47-acre parcel, with four existing tennis courts and parking spaces, was originally part of the open space of the Cordillo Courts and the Hedges condominium developments. The parcel was sold in the early 1980s to the Van Der Meer Tennis Center. The Town purchased the property in 2002 with the intent of using the facility as tennis courts open to the general public.

In the spring of 2016, the Town negotiated with the Cordillo Courts II Property Owners Association and the Hedges Property Owners Association to sell the property, but Town Council did not approve the sale.

The general design principles include a park that upgrades facilities for racquet sports and creates a new community gathering space.

The community building would be a small building but would have a general meeting space that could be used for anyone in the community that wants to meet there. It would include rest room facilities, a small office and a storage area.

Councilman Lennox stated two concerns on a project like this would be is it practical and what are the economics imbedded into the project. Is it practical – perhaps, but are there other options on the south side – are there sites that could be used that would be more practical. Our basis in this land is \$250,000 approximately I believe. Ms. Cyran said it was her understanding originally the Town paid \$200,000 for it. I was given some information on Friday and haven't had a chance to review it, but could be that the Town paid \$400,000 for it.

Councilman Lennox stated he thinks what they want to do is get a feel for what the investment will be into this property and are there other options where the investment can be used to serve a greater population on the south side.

Councilman Ames said I think we are looking at this at a conceptual level today and on that basis I am strongly in favor of looking at this as an opportunity for the south end of the Island. We are well aware of the demand for recreational facilities on the south end. From my standpoint and I think it was Marc's idea that there be youth tennis involved in this. That makes sense to me so on a conceptual level I am in favor of pursuing this.

Chairman Grant asked about green space. Have you looked at a place for kids to just play? Ms. Cyran said that was definitely a possibility if one of the courts was removed. I think

otherwise the site is pretty tight with parking and if there is a building placed on it, there wouldn't be much room for a playground area or a facility for kids to play. Another possibility could be trying to with the changes to the sizes of the street buffers – it could be possible to reduce the street buffer on the property and create a horizontal play space. It wouldn't be large but definitely something staff can look into. Councilman Ames asked if we had the capability of removing a tennis court.

Charles Cousins stated they have estimated the cost to refurbish the courts at \$265,000. Regarding removing a court – if we put in youth courts which are smaller we would have to look at the covenants and consider does that mean the covenants – if so, we could maybe pull up one court and make some green space.

Chairman Grant asked for public comment. Mr. George Poletta stated the south end of the island is forgotten as far as recreation goes. The proposal before you includes a recreation building which would provide for the south end residents to have access to a meeting facility. Please make this project a cornerstone of your tenor on this Town Council.

Mr. Greg Wynn stated he has a management company on the Island and he manages one of the regimes, The Hedges and said they are really excited about the opportunity that the Town is now going to take on the responsibility of maintaining the four courts and converting a couple into youth courts. We will be following the conceptual plan.

Frank Soule, Island Recreation Association stated they were in agreement with doing the conceptual plan and have been talking about it for several years. They are looking forward to being part of the process.

Steve Riley, Town Manager clarified there was a building on the site we are talking about for a community center many years ago but was not there when the Town purchased it. The purchase contract was for \$400,000 of which \$150,000 was a tax deductible gift. The cash paid by the Town was \$250,000 that reflected the value of the courts to the Town. We did resurface those courts once but when we resurfaced them they were at the end of their useful life and that is where the conversation began about replacing this with something else. We can and should move forward with the conceptual plan. I caution that it could be less than satisfactory for all parties because parking is going to be a concern, the size of the building that you can actually fit there will be a concern. We have been talking about this as youth tennis, pickle ball and I fear we will have more expectations and more users than we actually can accommodate here. I caution that we can do something here but I think we will find it very constrained for all opportunities.

Councilman Lennox asked if we were bound by the same terms and conditions of the agreement that was signed between Sea Cabin and Vandemeer. Mr. Riley answered yes. We accepted this acquisition with all the terms and conditions.

Councilman Ames said as a Town I think at some point we will have to transition to anticipate bikes and shuttles. I hope down the road there will be some sort of drop off place in this area. I am hoping we are less car dependent on the south end of the Island.

Councilman Ames moved that we move staff's recommendation for conceptual planning for this proposed Cordillo Tennis Court Park and the elements that they have specified to Town Council. Councilman Lennox seconded subject to staff exploring the options to this in the

immediate area. Councilman Ames wanted clarification on the motion and stated the Town is obligated to deal with these courts. Courts are important to the south end of the Island. We are not going to build courts somewhere else. Is your motion to determine whether or not it makes sense for the Town to spend money on this particular site as opposed to spending it someplace else and selling this? Councilman Lennox answered yes. The motion unanimously passed.

- **Continuation of Discussion on a Plan for the Scheduling of Improvements of Privately Owned Roads**

Scott Liggett said last week's meeting was to talk about the scope and other details regarding the potential acquisition of currently privately owned roads for the purposes of ultimately paving them. We discussed last week of the opportunity here today to talk about the legal requirements and the potential for the Town to engage agents of the Town, not Town staff to go out into the community to broach the topic with the impacted and benefiting property owners. To that regard, both Gregg Alford and Brian Hulbert are here today and I would invite them to approach the Committee. Staff is prepared as well to begin to share with you a couple of options as we see it regarding the overall programmatic scheduling of this work. There are some assumptions of course that are interwoven into all of this which we will get into once we have gotten beyond the legal discussion we would like to have. Our purpose of course is to try and find an appropriate balance and approach here that can be endorsed by the Committee so that we can move something along, ideally to Council.

Brian Hulbert, Staff Attorney started off with can the Town use volunteers to assist in the process of acquiring fee simple or easements on the dirt road areas that the Town wants to acquire. The answer is yes, but a qualified yes from me. I guess it is a lawyer's nightmare as far as sending volunteers out there to represent the Town. My concern is what promises or statements are they going to make that the Town will have to answer for later and try and refute or contradict. What happens if they are injured while working as a volunteer for the Town? It is nothing we cannot assume the risk for as long as we know it going in and are willing to assume that risk and try to take as many measures as possible to try and protect ourselves from that aspect. We have to make sure they understand the rules as far as the statements they can make, as far as the LMO interpretations and the promises related to the laws of the Town as far as what applies to those properties and how they can explain that as the Town wants it explained to the residents there. The fact that they are not going to be paid or reimbursed for the expenses unless the Town chooses to reimburse them for mileage per diem whatever the case may be.

Gregg Alford said he generally agrees with Brian's observation. You are essentially deputizing people to be your right of way agents which is fine if everyone is aware of the scope of their agency, appropriate representations that can and cannot be made. I think it is very well intentioned and worthy. I am not saying no, I am simply saying that if we want to do this we probably need to develop something like SDOT has - a right of way agent manual, SCANA has a right of way agent manual, etc. They are right of way agents and know the boxes that they have to work in. My biggest concern is that we put ourselves in a place where the property owner might have one expectation based on the representations of the agent and it doesn't turn out to be true.

The process works like this – Council tells us we want to pave this road so then we develop a plat. The plat tells us exactly what needs to be taken. It then tells us what is left on the residual piece. If we develop a plat and we have a very clear understanding of the zoning effects, the density effects on the remainder of parcels of the land owners.

If some of this property is heir's property, it can be dealt with but becomes more problematic. We have dealt with it in the past and could deal with it again. Another thing that runs across the back of my mind in this is at some level someone will be out there making representation about the legal effects we are going to have on their property. It might be worthy to have an independent third party counsel that these folks can go to and talk to.

Chairman Grant said the way he visualized it was if there is a blanket contract that talks about specific things and somewhere at the end you would have something where you would ask them to go to an attorney and get advice. Mr. Alford said either they are advised to go to an independent attorney or you recognize you waive your right. That would absolutely work.

Chairman Grant said once they get all the contracts back how long will it take to process before you can go ahead and begin the roads. Mr. Hulbert said depends on the property and how much legal work is involved. Like he said the heir's property – you can get it done in three months or 50 years. Chairman Grant said let's take out the heir's properties – how long would it take. Mr. Alford stated that Scott Liggett would address that.

Councilman Ames stated he heard in our last meeting from Mel Campbell a serious concern about this program generally. It made me wonder whether or not a large percentage of those people who might benefit from paved roads really were seeking our support in getting them built. On the other side of the equation is our responsibility as a Town to provide ready access for emergency vehicles, etc. If we go down the road so to speak asking community members do they want their road paved and they say no, are we shunning our responsibility as a Town to provide ready access. I think that is a ticklish balance. My inclination is to go to the community with volunteers to have that kind of conversation and see where we come out. I don't see the volunteers as people who are going to be negotiating rights of ways, etc. I see them being used and employed as we did in the sewer situation to grease the skids so to speak and introduce the possibility and then have the Town take over to do the leg work, engineering work and legal work, etc. If we go down that path where we are saying we are going to leave it up to those people effected to determine their fate regarding the roads, then I would say our criteria for selection is not what we believe is most necessary, but those roads that the residents come together and say we want paved. On the other hand if we go in the other direction and we are saying we are doing it for a public benefit, and we are going to be condemning property to do that then you have a situation where you go to a road that has the most residents on it and represents the greatest risk for fire and safety and emergency vehicles. I think we have a fundamental question to be answered. I would very much like to hear from the residents who would be effected a more unanimous point of view as to the benefits of this program.

Chairman Grant said he agrees with the balance between the safety issues. I do know that there are many people in the community who want their roads paved. The question is what Mel Campbell brought up was this may be the road today, but how will the road look in the future because there is no real development. Example – if you have ten mobile homes on five acres of property, those ten mobile homes were possible put there for the short term. They visualize something later on where they can actually build homes on it and then they want to build a road. Now they are not ready for the Town to get involved with paving your road. That is the choice that individual property owners have a right to do. However, there are some communities that is already well established and have designated roads and they are not changing any time soon. They already know if they add more homes to the area where they will be placed. In those type of communities I think you will see more people coming forward ready to move to the top of the list based on what we talked about to get that road paved. There are some roads that are so bad you can't even go down – that may be considered a safety issue. That might be something where the Town might have to look into.

Councilman Ames said he thinks that if the affected area wants their road paved and they can get a consensus, then the Town should be supporting them and have the roads paved.

Scott Liggett touched on the program policy discussions – the things that we alluded to a little bit that we are drilling down into deeper here today that we talked about last week and the notion of road hierarchy – those roads that served more homes should be ranked higher or be of greater interest to the Town than the ones lower. The work that we have done since last week essentially does that and focuses the discussion on the 33 dirt roads right now privately owned that serve more than 5. We had talked last week about the existing County road policy and took a stab at a boiler plate document that could conceivably be used as a way for the current land owners to express an interest in participating in this program. We may need to wordsmith this a little bit based on today's discussion but one of the things that we did talk about last week is an opportunity for folks if you will to opt in or to opt out. Right now we are assuming equal receptiveness to all 33 roads in practice that may not bear out. Trying to reach out to the community volunteers to seek this initial expression of interest is something that may serve us well as we try to go ahead and program what the needs are long term.

If we are constrained to operate within those 33 roads we have spoken of, we estimate the total cost of construction, utility relocation, field work plus the supporting soft costs, legal work, surveying, engineering, testing, and permitting with no cost for land acquisition to roughly be about \$12,000,000. We have taken some estimates and I will need to reconfirm all of what I am about to say with Steve Riley, John Troyer and Chief Tadlock. Of the road usage fee that was imposed here 18 months or so ago, the work that staff has done to this point assumes we could devote on average about \$700,000 a year to achieve this \$12,000,000 goal. If you do some real simple math you can see if we took a potential pay as you go approach with all 33 roads, you are going to land at a potential completion somewhere in excess of 15 years. If that is thought to not be fast enough what would be the options to augment the cash flow to make it happen more quickly. Do we consider increasing the road usage fee, do we consider a bond issuance relying on that road usage fee revenue stream to cover the debt service. Staff used that

latter approach to try and book end this relying on those road usage fee revenue streams in an attempt to try and drive this to a time period of 7 years requires the potential bond issuance of about \$6,500,000. One of the challenges of that approach insofar as securing the bonds is that because the revenue stream is so relatively new and we do not have a long history of how successful that might be, any seasonality of it. Certainly John Troyer can speak for himself, but I think there are some reservations he has about us starting the program with the first thing we do is secure a bond to make that happen. On top of that, the continued complexity that hangs over us – how quickly we may be able to assemble the land and I think John as well as you will appreciate the fact that we do not want to immediately borrow that sort of money and not be able to use it. How likely we would be to acquire any or all of these roads remains to be seen. Is there a hybrid of these two options where we continue down a path trying to engage community interest? From staff's perspective we have identified as many as eight roads immediately that we could advance that are at the top of our priority list. Seeing what comes forward to respect to the transfer of land with the potential that maybe we consider a bond issue down the road if the land comes forward. Like I said the primary concern being the newness of the revenue stream and the concern that we have that we may not be able to get the public interest and the transfer of land to make that money usable as quickly as need be.

The other policy decision as we continue the discussion, the road right of way must be donated. That is a path once we head down it I would suggest is very difficult to retreat from. The last comment – condemnations as relates to any of these clouded title properties which in some case I am sure we will get into.

With respect to the two options – the pay as you go vs. some other mechanism, staff spent a fair amount of time trying to sort out what would be the activities that could go on, how many of those are reliant on the completion altogether of prior activities, how many of them can run parallel paths to a point.

Mr. Liggett showed a chart with two lines – the first bar was meant as an opportunity or time window that property owners could volunteer or come forward with this expression of interest. We have in this rough time period an allowance of about six months for that to come forward such that those roads where we do have an interest could be reviewed by staff, considered by Council during the time of year that budgets are developed for potential inclusion in the budget the following year.

The other item is difficult for us to predict is the actual transfer of that land – how long that may take for folks to commit and do what they had expressed an interest in doing. Those two things make it difficult to have a reliable schedule put forth. From start to finish here the way staff had sized it up, it was roughly a 15 month period to go through the expression of interest, the survey work, the design, permitting and construction because most of these roads are all relatively small order. Any one road should not take a long time to construct. In that regard what we would endeavor to do is to try and batch these and achieve some economies so that if you did have road owners on six roads let all those come forward and batch those into a single group. In fact, there may be some opportunities as we get down into the weeds in this discussion here of some sort of design build arrangement. Once we would impose a time period for folks to let

us hear from them, express their interest, collect all of those, batch them out and move ahead with a block of roads.

Those are the two bookend schedules – 15 years – do we like that, is it too long, is that about right – if we need to do it quicker, we are going to have to identify potential funding source to augment it. We would also have to probably visit this in a little greater detail at the staff level because as folks have alluded to, the work program definitely touches folks in our Community Development Department, Fire Rescue and Emergency Response as I am sure there will be some legal support needs, etc.

Councilman Ames asked if there were any roads that are prepped to go today. Mr. Liggett advised no – we are working right now through the CDBG Program on Cobia Court. That is the one that is closest. You also may remember we have roads that are under contract in and around the South Forest Beach area.

Councilman Ames stated he thinks the program moves forward at the point where we say volunteers go into the community and begin to assess the likelihood of being able to list high priority in terms of consensus roads. The Town would then respond to those possibilities. That would begin to dictate whether or not a bond was necessary or not. We are not in a place today to say that a bond is absolutely essential and it really depends on the community's effected in their response to whether or not they want to move forward. I would say that our decision has more to do with how do we conceptualize a goal and then secondly how we get the information and how we communicate best with the effected community to understand their appetite and participate.

Chairman Grant said he would have to digest some of this stuff and said he is not interested in doing 15 years still addressing roads. I think we need to move quicker than that. One of my concerns is trying to visualize how we would do this and make it be a smooth transaction from once we get volunteers, then we turn to the Town and then the Town moves to initiate the legal process and then you are ready to pave. In that timeframe how long would it take to get all this done. One thing you don't want to happen is when you have the community members out there saying this is what you can do but 2-3 years later they are still waiting on the road to be paved.

Mr. Liggett said the concepts that we have talked about essentially we would have a block of roads whereby we would be attempting to acquire the land and then at the same time during that fiscal year we would have a block of roads we were paving. You would move essentially from one year to the next to make that happen. My interest on behalf of the Town is to not own dirt roads any longer than we need to from a maintenance perspective. My preference is that they not come into the Town system and live as a dirt road for 3-4-5 years because of the maintenance demands that will create. The speed of the program I would tell you to this point is almost entirely or at least mostly dictated by the speed from which land comes forward. If Council is firm in their position that the donations of land are required are predicated for us to take action, I would suggest that the community then themselves is able to dictate the schedule frankly as much or more than I am. I would like to have the problem of having more roads ready to pave than we have funding and I am sure we can work with

Council to come up with some plan to address that. To try and enjoin the community in helping us more as quickly as they want us to move I think is important.

Councilman Grant said he is interested in somewhere between 5-7 year plan to get whatever roads done. At least we can say we did a full pledged effort to get it done. Councilman Ames said he would support that also. Councilman Ames said something we ought to be thinking about is if we are not condemning and buying land then what is the incentive the Town can put on the table to encourage people to do it and does it have something to do with density, is it an LMO issue, etc.

Councilman Ames asked if there was action they should take today. Are we coming to something we would recommend to Town Council? Councilman Grant said he thought we were going to have a discussion at the Town Council Workshop. Councilman Grant said they have a lot of information but I think we need to come up with something to bring to the Workshop that we would take action for the year.

Councilman Ames said a suggestion would be we do have some experience with volunteers in the sewer installation situation and maybe we ought to try and learn from that experience and replicate it to the greatest degree that makes sense in this situation. That seems to me to be a critical next step in order to expedite the process.

Chairman Grant asked Mr. Liggett to come up with a possible plan for 5-7 years to see what that would look at so we can have a discussion about it. Mr. Liggett said they have handouts here today. The seven year plan necessitates at this point an option to get to the 7 year implementation the issuance of bonds to the tune of \$6,500,000.

Mr. Liggett said there are a handful of policy decisions ultimately we need to alert Council of and I will follow your lead if this is something you would like to occur just in a staff briefing assuming it meets with the Mayor's approval at the meeting on November 7th. It may necessitate further discussion at the Workshop. The policy decisions thus far that I believe will find their way to Council – 1) the roads that serve more than 5 dwellings, 2) the expression of interest from the landowners before we advance any of our work, 3) the donation of rights of way and drainage easements as may be necessary, 4) the expectation that condemnations also may be necessary but only for circumstances of clouded title and 5) the use of volunteers, however Council sees fit. Those are the five policy discussions thus far outside of the funding limitations we may have that perhaps it would be a worthwhile point to check back in with full Council and alert them to those policy issues that seem to be emerging here at the Committee level.

Councilman Lennox moved that we add to Town council Agenda for November 7th a policy discussion led by staff. Councilman Ames seconded. The motion unanimously passed.

Chairman Grant asked for public comment. Mayor Bennett said he doesn't know how we want to handle the roads with fewer than five homes on them to the extent they are ready and they come forward while we are working on the roads that have more than five homes on them. That may bear some additional consideration on our part.

Secondly, just to add emphasis to the importance of volunteers. I think we cannot place enough emphasis on trust or lack thereof in the community. I think those volunteers go a very long way to move us down the road because they already have that relationship intact. That was probably the single reason the easement effort for the sanitary sewer initiative was as successful and as expedient as it has been. One example would be that in a period of four months, three volunteers with those relationships in place secured 71 easements for sanitary sewer infrastructure. That is a remarkable pace. That is a very important component in my mind.

6. Adjournment

Chairman Grant moved to adjourn. Councilman Lennox seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 11:13 a.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karen D. Knox
Senior Administrative Assistant

DRAFT



TOWN OF HILTON HEAD ISLAND

Public Projects and Facilities Management Department

TO: Stephen G. Riley, ICMA-CM, Town Manager
VIA: Scott Liggett, PE, Director of PP&F/Chief Engineer
FROM: Jeff Buckalew, PE, Town Engineer
James Cook, Engineering Technician
CC: Brian Hulbert, Staff Attorney
DATE: October 30, 2017
SUBJECT: Recommendation of Policies to Guide the Private Unpaved Road
Acquisition and Paving Program

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that Town Council approve five key policy decisions needed to guide the private unpaved road acquisition and paving program.

Summary:

The five key policy issues to be resolved for the advancement of the private, unpaved road acquisition and paving program are listed below with staff recommendations.

1. **To qualify for this program, the road must serve more than 5 dwellings / address points. Please see the attached list of the thirty-three qualifying roads.**
2. **Property owners must express interest in public road right of way assemblage (100% willing participation).**
3. **Land for the public road right of way must be donated to the Town.**
4. **Condemn land only as necessary due to unclear title issues (i.e., heirs' property).**
5. **Community volunteers may assist staff with facilitating right of way donations.**

Background

1. **To qualify for this program, the road must serve more than 5 dwellings / address points**
This mimics the Beaufort County policy for accepting private roads (must serve at least six dwelling units) and is based on the premise that the Land Management Ordinance allows for subdivisions to be created / developed for 5 lots and less without having to establish and record a road right of way or install right of way infrastructure (road pavement and drainage) to current standards. Although private

roads serving five or less dwellings may have a name for addressing purposes, they are essentially private driveways.

2. Property owners must express interest in public road right of way assemblage (100% willing participation)

This policy issue also mimics the Beaufort County policy and puts the onus on those property owners with land at stake to achieve a consensus agreement that they want the road to be public and to be maintained by the government. The Town does not intend to forcibly make a road public without the willing consent of the affected land owners. This will be a major factor in the implementation schedule for the program.

3. Land for the public road right of way must be donated to the Town.

This is strictly a voluntary program for private road owners that want their road to be public. The Town will not compensate land owners for the road right of way or the right to improve their private roads. This will require a fee simple transfer of land to the Town. In return the Town will maintain the road right of way in perpetuity. The Town will absorb the cost of surveying, title work and legal services for recording the transfer.

4. Condemn land only as necessary due to unclear probate or recording title issues (i.e., heirs' property)

There will only be "friendly" condemnations done out of necessity as part of this program. These will entail properties where the locally residing owner wishes to donate land necessary for a public right of way, but due to clouded title they are unable to legally do so. The qualifying types of issues will be probate or gaps in the title chain, such as heirs' properties where the local or majority owner wishes to donate the land but legally cannot do so. The Town will provide legal assistance where recording errors or incorrect legal descriptions cause the title to be clouded. The Town will not condemn in cases where the property needs to be cleared of liens, foreclosures, or fraud. The Town Attorney will prepare condemnation documents for filing upon Town Council direction and approval.

5. Community volunteers may assist staff with facilitating right of way donations.

Community volunteers may provide aid in facilitating right of way donations. This may be in the form of communication and organization regarding the program, distribution and collection of petitions, forms, exhibits, documents, etc., and promoting the general benefits of this opportunity. The Town's project manager shall work closely with the volunteer(s) - holding public meetings, meeting with individual property owners, providing documents, data, exhibits, etc. It is very important that there be clear communication that this is a voluntary program and an opportunity for property owners to work together for government assistance to improve their neighborhood.

EXHIBIT A

PRIVATE DIRT ROAD ACQ RATINGS (GROUPED BY # OF DWELLINGS & ADT)

| ROAD NAME | CONCIL DISTRICT | LENGTH (MILES) | # OF HOUSES SERVED | SECTION 1 ROAD USE | SECTION 2 MAINTENANCE | SECTION 3 EXISTING EASEMENTS | SECTION 4 BENEFIT / COST | TOTAL SCORE | RANK | # OF PARCELS /ADT | |
|--|-----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|------|-------------------|-----|
| FY 14-16 (GREATER THAN 5 DWELLINGS) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Alfred Lane | 1 | 0.152 | 18 | 18 | 30 | 8 | 1.33 | 62.64 | 1 | 14 | 180 |
| Murray Avenue | 1 | 0.137 | 22 | 22 | 25 | 5 | 1.67 | 60.33 | 2 | 20 | 220 |
| Aiken Place | 1 | 0.206 | 17 | 22 | 25 | 2 | 1.05 | 54.23 | 3 | 15 | 170 |
| Cobia Court | 1 | 0.319 | 14 | 17 | 25 | 5 | 0.50 | 49.50 | 4 | 10 | 140 |
| Alice Perry Drive | 6 | 0.148 | 9 | 20 | 25 | 5 | 0.90 | 54.51 | 5 | 7 | 90 |
| Pine Field Road | 1 | 0.118 | 10 | 10 | 25 | 15 | 0.57 | 52.83 | 6 | 15 | 100 |
| Mitchellville Lane | 6 | 0.275 | 11 | 11 | 15 | 25 | 0.27 | 52.36 | 7 | 13 | 110 |
| Bligen Lane | 1 | 0.250 | 18 | 20 | 25 | 0 | 0.48 | 47.40 | 8 | 14 | 180 |
| FY 17 (GREATER THAN 5 DWELLINGS) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Amelia Drive | 1 | 0.122 | 7 | 7 | 30 | 10 | 0.36 | 48.80 | 1 | 7 | 70 |
| Christopher Drive | 1 | 0.187 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 5 | 0.32 | 46.60 | 2 | 11 | 100 |
| Freddies Way | 1 | 0.079 | 11 | 11 | 20 | 5 | 0.67 | 39.36 | 5 | 8 | 110 |
| Manatee Way | 3 | 0.255 | 17 | 17 | 10 | 10 | 0.33 | 38.64 | 6 | 2 | 170 |
| Sam Frazier Retreat | 1 | 0.061 | 9 | 9 | 20 | 5 | 0.67 | 37.37 | 7 | 7 | 90 |
| Horse Sugar Lane | 6 | 0.136 | 6 | 6 | 30 | 0 | 0.21 | 37.06 | 8 | 5 | 60 |
| Orage Lane | 1 | 0.121 | 14 | 14 | 20 | 0 | 0.53 | 36.63 | 9 | 8 | 140 |
| Mackeral Drive | 1 | 0.120 | 9 | 9 | 20 | 5 | 0.34 | 35.71 | 12 | 6 | 90 |
| Farmers Club Drive | 1 | 0.056 | 6 | 6 | 25 | 0 | 0.45 | 33.23 | 18 | 4 | 60 |
| Sadie Common | 1 | 0.076 | 6 | 6 | 25 | 0 | 0.33 | 32.63 | 19 | 11 | 60 |
| Junior Trace | 1 | 0.080 | 6 | 6 | 20 | 5 | 0.31 | 32.55 | 20 | 5 | 60 |
| Great Barracuda Lane | 6 | 0.092 | 10 | 10 | 20 | 0 | 0.44 | 32.18 | 21 | 6 | 100 |
| Benjamin Drive | 1 | 0.135 | 6 | 6 | 20 | 5 | 0.18 | 31.92 | 22 | 6 | 60 |
| Red Tip View | 1 | 0.153 | 6 | 6 | 25 | 0 | 0.16 | 31.81 | 23 | 6 | 60 |
| William Drive | 1 | 0.106 | 6 | 8 | 20 | 0 | 0.28 | 29.41 | 25 | 7 | 60 |
| Palm Tree Place | 6 | 0.156 | 8 | 8 | 20 | 0 | 0.19 | 28.96 | 26 | 2 | 80 |
| Blossom Place | 1 | 0.041 | 6 | 6 | 20 | 0 | 0.51 | 28.53 | 27 | 2 | 60 |
| Eugene Drive | 1 | 0.059 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 0.35 | 27.76 | 28 | 5 | 60 |
| Sassafras Lane | 1 | 0.089 | 6 | 6 | 20 | 0 | 0.23 | 27.17 | 34 | 4 | 60 |
| Candy Doll Bluff | 1 | 0.089 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 0.37 | 26.87 | 35 | 8 | 100 |
| Amelia Court | 1 | 0.135 | 6 | 6 | 15 | 5 | 0.15 | 26.77 | 36 | 4 | 60 |
| Indian Pipe Lane | 1 | 0.069 | 7 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 0.30 | 23.48 | 50 | 2 | 70 |
| Triggerfish Trail | 6 | 0.146 | 6 | 6 | 15 | 0 | 0.12 | 21.58 | 51 | 6 | 60 |
| Grant Drive | 1 | 0.094 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 0 | 0.17 | 17.84 | 60 | 2 | 70 |
| Clifford Miller Drive | 1 | 0.103 | 7 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0.06 | 7.32 | 71 | 2 | 70 |
| Sapos Place | 6 | 0.041 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0.12 | 6.59 | 73 | 3 | 60 |

TEXT COLOR DENOTES ROADS IN SEWER MASTER PLAN